



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/856,321	11/19/2001	Oskar Dauner	051480-5045	6679

7590 01/13/2003

Morgan Lewis & Bockius
1701 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-2921

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, TAN QUANG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3661	

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/856,321	Applicant(s) DAUNER ET AL.
	Examiner TAN Q NGUYEN	Art Unit 3661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
 Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 November 2001.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>1</u>	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
---	---

DETAIL ACTION

Notice to Applicant(s)

1. This application has been examined. Claims 1-11 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
3. The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. As per claim 6, line 3, the phrase "can be" should not be used in the claimed language. Appropriate correction is requested.
5. As per claim 7, line 3, the term "oeprator" should be --operator--. Correction is required.
6. The following rejections are based on the examiner's best interpretation of the claims in light of the 35 U.S.C. 112 errors noted above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

8. Claims 1-4 and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Eitzenberger (6,023,232).

9. As per claim 1, Eitzenberger discloses the invention as claimed which includes at least one processor unit for controlling applications (see at least the abstract), a plurality of operator consoles which are connected to the processor unit and having user interfaces for accessing the applications and for data playback (see figure 1 and column 3, lines 52-65), and a central system controller having a priority management system for allocating to the individual operator consoles access rights with different degrees of priority to the application (see at least column 2, lines 30-50, column 3, lines 22-51, and column 7, line 32 to column 8, line 4).

10. As per claim 2, such feature is shown in at least column 4, lines 26-56 of the Eitzenberger reference.

11. As per claims 3, 8 and 9, such features are shown in at least figure 1 and the related text.

12. As per claim 4, Eitzenberger disclose that the priority management system allocates to the applications individual access rights to a data bus and/or to the processor unit (see at least column 4, line 66 to column 5, line 20).

13. As per claim 7, Eitzenberger also disclose such feature in at least column 5, line 66 to column 6, line 20.

14. As per claim 10, it is a method claim corresponding to apparatus claim 1.

Therefore, claim 10 is rejected for the same rationales set forth for claim 1.

15. As per claim 11, the at least user prompting at the man/machine is inherently disclosed in the Eitzenberger via the interfaces of the associated devices as shown in at least figure 1 and column 3, lines 52-59.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

18. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eitzenberger as applied to the claims above, and further in view of Sridhar et al. (5,960,035).

19. Eitzenberger discloses the claimed invention as discussed above except that the priority management system allocates to the applications access to the data bus as a function of the loading of the data bus at that time and at least one low-level application can be aborted or reduced the data transmission rate. However, such features are taught in the Sridhar et al. in at least the abstract, figures 3, 5, 6 and column 6-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Sridhar et al. into the system of Eitzenberger in order to provide the system with the enhanced capability of prioritizing the access rights to the applications based on the loading of the data bus.

Conclusion

20. All claims are rejected.

21. The following references are cited as being of general interest: Kobayashi (5,699,250), Beckert et al. (6,009,363), Weiss (6,038,500), Bhatia et al. (6,112,101), Minowa et al. (6,240,340) and Obradovich (6,275,231).

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Tan Nguyen, whose telephone number is (703) 305-9755. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 5:30 AM-4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Cuchlinski, can be reached on (703) 308-3873.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:


Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 305-7687, (for informal or draft communications, please label
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park V, 2451
Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Seventh Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be
directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tan Nguyen", is written over a stylized, abstract line drawing that looks like a checkmark or a signature itself.

TAN Q. NGUYEN
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3661

/tqn
January 7, 2003